



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,300	05/08/2007	David I. Yule	21108.0042U2	1912
23859	7590	02/04/2009		
Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP SUITE 1000 999 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915			EXAMINER	
			PAK, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			16-46	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/587,300	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YULE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Michael Pak	<b>Art Unit</b> 1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-26 and 30-89 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 29 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 27-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1449)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, SEQ ID NO:9 in the reply filed on October 24, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the reference does not teach the specific mutations. This is not found persuasive because the technical feature is lacking in the broadest claim 1 as discussed in the 35 USC rejection below.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-89 are pending. Claims 1-6 and 27-29 are examined. Claims 7-26 and 30-89 are withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-6 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims recite the term "inositol 1,4,5-triphosphate receptor mutant" which is ambiguous because the metes and bounds of the term is unclear. The claims differentiate by claim limitation to wild type and mutant but it is not clear when a receptor is a wild type since there are polymorphisms which are different from one another and

there is no specific wild type for comparison. Such relative terms which have no specific receptor identification renders the claims ambiguous. Furthermore, claims recite specific amino acid positions yet there is no specific limitations to a specific SEQ ID NO:. Such positions are relative positions which are ambiguous.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikoshiba et al. (US 6,465,211) in view of Roos et al. (US 2007/0031814).

Mikoshiba et al. disclose the high affinity inositol 1,4,5-triphosphate receptor and teach mutants and mutagenesis of the receptor (column 5). Mikoshiba et al. does not teach the specific serine substitution.

Roos et al. teach the amino acid substitution of serine with negatively charged amino acids especially phosphorylation sites (paragraphs 120, 132, 173, 222, 349).

Roos et al. teach that inositol 1,4,5-triphosphate receptor are important for calcium mobilization (paragraphs 5, 152, 173, and 429).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the inositol 1,4,5-triphosphate receptor of Mikoshiba by incorporating the teachings of Roos et al. to substitute the serines with negatively charged amino acids. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found such substitution obvious in view of teachings of Mikoshiba et al. who contemplate changes in amino acid by substitutions (column 5). Furthermore, Mikoshiba et al. and Roos et al. are analogous references which examine inositol 1,4,5-triphosphate receptor.

5. Claim 29 is allowed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael Pak/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646  
January 19, 2009